



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,528	02/25/2002	Mark W. Lambert	15786-035001	9800
26181	7590	11/06/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			KIM, EUNHEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/085,528	LAMBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Eunhee Kim	2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13 and 15-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, and 15-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 09/10/2008 has been received and considered. Claims 1-9, 11-13, and 15-39 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. The prior art used for these rejections is as follows:

a. The Feb.3, 2001 version of the official corporate website of D-cubed, Ltd. of Cambridge, England, reads upon the claimed invention as stored in the "Internet Wayback Machine". (<http://www.archive.org/web/200102010708001/http://www.d-cubed.co.uk>) D-cubed, Ltd. is the developer of the 2D Dimensional Constraint Manager product. (Referred to as "the D-cubed reference").

b. D-Cubed, Ltd. The 2D DCM Manual, Version 4.2. January 2002. ("2D DCM Manual").

c. KeyCAD Complete For Windows TM © 1994. pp.1-14, 9-6 to 9-8, A-11 to A- 1 to A-14, and I-3. ("KeyCAD").

3. Claim 1-9, 11-13, and 15-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the D-cubed reference, in view of 2D DCM Manual, and further in view of KeyCAD.

In regards to Claim 1, the D-cubed reference teaches the following limitations:

1. (Previously presented) A method comprising:
receiving an indication of modification to the CAD geometry piece;
automatically modifying the CAD geometry piece and its boundary based at least upon the received indication; and
automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features to be continuously enclosed within the boundary of the modified CAD geometry piece, based at least upon the modified CAD geometry piece and the received input.

The section of the D-cubed reference titled "What is variational design?" on the page titled "The 2D and 3D Dimensional Constraint Managers: Overview" teaches the following (emphasis added):

In brief, variational techniques enable the end-user to specify and control their geometric models through the use of simple rules. Such rules frequently include dimensions and constraints. Dimensions, such as distances, angles and radii, have an easily understood interpretation. The meaning of constraints is less obvious. In fact they are simply rules that restrict, i.e. constrain, the behavior of the geometries in the model. Examples of constraints include parallelism, tangency and concentricity.

To modify a model, the end-user simply specifies a change to the rules, such as a modified value for a dimension. The DCM then automatically re-calculates the locations of all the geometries affected by the new dimension value, whilst ensuring that their final locations are consistent with the previously applied dimensions and constraints. The end-user does not have to re-position the geometries manually to create the new configuration; hence their productivity is greatly enhanced.

Examiner finds that the claimed "boundary" is one of the "constraints" taught in the section recited above, because the contents within the boundary must remain within the boundary when the boundary is changed. Since requiring the contents to remain within the boundary is a rule that restricts, *i.e. constrains*, the behavior of the geometries in the model, it is a constraint as defined by the D-cubed reference.

The D-cubed reference, while teaching the following limitation, does not teach it in great detail:

automatically modifying the CAD geometry piece and its boundary based at least upon the received indication; and

2D DCM Manual, on the other hand, expressly teaches: (1) how a pattern constraint may be used in models containing groups of geometries repeated in a regular manner (see Section 4.2.11

"Pattern Constraints"), (2) the best way to add constraints onto groups of patterned geometries (Sections 12.4 "Patterns"), and (3) the use of pattern constraints to make regular polygons (12.5 "Regular Polygons"), (4) how a fixed geometry (a vertical line, which corresponds to claimed "boundary") and an unfixed geometry (a rectangle and a point) are solved when a modification of the geometry is received (see Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode", the associated Fig.4), and (5) maintaining the features on one side of a fixed line (see Section 2.4 "Chirality", especially pp.22-23; and sections 5.2 and 5.3).

The D-cubed reference and 2D DCM Manual are analogous art because they teach features of the same product.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the D-cubed reference and 2D DCM Manual because they teach features of the same product.

The suggestion/motivation for combining the references would have been that they teach features of the same product.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the D-cubed reference with 2D DCM Manual to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

Neither the D-cubed reference nor the 2D DCM Manual, however, expressly teach the following limitations:

receiving an input for a pattern, the pattern comprising a plurality of features enclosed within a boundary of a CAD geometry piece where a feature corresponds to a feature of the CAD geometry piece;

automatically maintaining continuous enclosure of the pattern within the boundary of the modified CAD geometry piece, including

KeyCAD, on the other hand, expressly teaches the use of a "Group" button, which "is used to consolidate a set of selected objects as one grouped object." (see p. 1-14, A-13). "Notice in the previous example that the objects have individual boundary points when not grouped. After grouping the objects, they share the same boundary points." (see p.9-7, A-13). The KeyCAD reference therefore teaches the limitation of "the pattern comprising a plurality of features enclosed within a boundary of a CAD geometry piece where a feature corresponds to a feature of the CAD geometry piece" and "automatically maintaining continuous enclosure of the pattern within the boundary of the modified CAD geometry piece."

The D-cubed reference, 2D DCM Manual, and KeyCAD are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of CAD software.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of D-cubed reference and 2D DCM Manual with those of KeyCAD, because all address the problems of manipulating grouped objects.

The suggestion/motivation for combining the references would have been KeyCAD's teachings of grouping and ungrouping objects (see p.9-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify D-cubed reference and 2D DCM Manual with KeyCAD to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

In regards to Claim 2, the D-cubed web site teaches the following limitations:

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving the input comprises receiving an input corresponding to an indication of a direction, the indication having an X-component and a Y-component.

(Examiner finds that X and Y coordinates are inherently stored in 2-Dimensional CAD drawings)

In regards to Claim 3, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

3. The method of claim 1, wherein: said receiving the input includes receiving a boundary value, the boundary value having at least one of a maximum value and a minimum value defining a maximum and a minimum, respectively, for a distance between at least one feature and the boundary; and

(Examiner finds that minimum and maximum values correspond to the taught "constraints". See also Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features includes maintaining a distance between the at least one feature and the boundary within the boundary value.

(See also Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 4, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

4. The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving the indication of modification comprises receiving an indication of modification to a 2-D geometry piece parametrically defining the CAD geometry piece

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 5, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

5. The method of claim 4, wherein said receiving the modification to the geometry comprises receiving an indication of modification of a dimension of the 2-D geometry piece parametrically defining said CAD geometry piece.

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 6, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

6. The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving the input comprises receiving an indication to optimize the pattern.

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 7, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

7. The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying the CAD geometry piece comprises parametrically updating the CAD geometry piece.

(See Section 2.5~6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 8, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

8. The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features comprises automatically determining what modification, if any, is necessary to one or more dimension of at least one of the plurality of features.

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 9, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

9. (Currently amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features comprises automatically determining what modification, if any, is necessary to an inter-feature distance between each of the plurality of features, and changing the inter-feature distance between at least one feature and an adjacent feature upon determining the modification is necessary.

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 11, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

11. The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features comprises: automatically determining what modification, if any, is necessary to a first dimension in view of a determined modification to a second dimension, to maintain a relationship between said first and second dimensions, where the first dimension and the second dimension comprise first and second dimensions of each feature of the plurality of features, and

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

modifying at least one of the first dimension or the second dimension of each feature of the plurality of features. (See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 34, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

4. The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features includes removing one or more features from the pattern.

(See Sections 2.51 to 2.5.6.6 of the 2D DCM Manual.)

In regards to Claim 35, the D-cubed web site and the 2D DCM Manual teach the following limitations:

35. The method of claim 1, wherein said automatically modifying at least one of the pattern or the plurality of features includes adjusting a distance between at least one feature and the boundary such that the plurality of features are continuously included within the boundary.

(See Section 2.5.6.2 "Weighted Standard Solving Mode" of the 2D DCM Manual.)

4. Claims in claim set 2 (claims 12-13, 15-22, and 36-37) and claim set 3 (claims 23-33 and 38-39) are rejected based on the same reasoning as the claims in claim set 1 (claims 1-9, 11, and 34-35). Claim set 2 consists of apparatus claims, and claim set 3 consists of article of manufacture claims that recite limitations equivalent to those recited in the method claims of claim set 1, and which are rejected over the D-cubed web site, in view of 2D DCM Manual, and further in view of KeyCAD.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 09/10/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have argued that:

The Applicant respectfully submits that the grouping feature of KeyCad does not teach the recited feature "receiving an input for a pattern." Merely grouping multiple objects into one grouped object does not make a pattern out of the objects. The grouping feature of KeyCad groups multiple arbitrary objects together for ease of manipulation, but does not turn those arbitrary objects into a pattern. Thus, it cannot be said that KeyCad teaches or suggests "receiving an input for a pattern."

Examiner disagrees as KeyCad teaches the grouping feature that selects all objects that make up the door (See step 7, page A-13) which is corresponding to "receiving an input for a pattern". The applicants defines "pattern" as "a plurality of features enclosed within a boundary of a CAD geometry piece where a feature corresponds to a feature of the CAD geometry piece" in Claim 1. In the case all objects that make up the door is input for a pattern since all objects that make up the door is "a plurality of features enclosed within a boundary of a CAD geometry piece".

Applicants have argued that:

Further, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the D-Cubed reference, the 2D DCM Manual, and KeyCad does not teach or suggest "receiving an indication of modification to the CAD geometry piece," even if the grouping feature in KeyCad does teach "receiving an input for a pattern", which Applicant does not concede. First, the cited passages from the D-Cubed reference describes the user specifying a change to the rules (e.g., dimensions, constraints) governing the geometries, which is different from changing the geometry itself. [1] Thus, the D-Cubed reference cannot be said to teach or suggest "receiving an indication of modification to the CAD geometry piece."

As per [1], applicant arguments do not commensurate with the limitation presented. For example, applicant alleged "changing the geometry itself", and this limitation is absent from the claim. Thus, it is Examiner's position that D-Cubed reference teaches the limitation cited as D-Cubed reference teaches the new dimension value (modification to the CAD geometry piece) that the end-user specifies a change.

Further, see the below where the section of the D-cubed reference titled "What is variational design?" on the page titled "The 2D and 3D Dimensional Constraint Managers: Overview" teaches the following (emphasis added):

In brief, variational techniques enable the end-user to specify and control their geometric models through the use of simple rules. Such rules frequently include dimensions and constraints. Dimensions, such as distances, angles and radii, have an easily understood interpretation. The meaning of constraints is less obvious. In fact they are simply rules that restrict, i.e. constrain, the behavior of the geometries in the model. Examples of constraints include parallelism, tangency and concentricity.

To modify a model, the end-user simply specifies a change to the rules, such as a modified value for a dimension. The DCM then automatically re-calculates the locations of all the geometries affected by the new dimension value, whilst ensuring that their final locations are consistent with the previously applied dimensions and constraints. The end-user does not have to re-position the geometries manually to create the new configuration; hence their productivity is greatly enhanced.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eunhee Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-2164. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eunhee Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2123

/Paul L Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123